REMARKS

Status

Claims 17-29 are pending in the application. No claims have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Kassa for the telephonic interview on September 3, 2009. During the interview, the cited references and claims 17 and 23 were discussed and the following remarks were presented. Examiner Kassa demonstrated some agreement and requested that the arguments be presented formally.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 17-24 and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,031,053 ("Chamzas") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,911 ("Hattori"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0067509 ("Roylance").

Claim 23 is directed to a printing system including a host machine and a printing device. The interaction between the host machine and the printing device is described in numerous features of the claims. The Office Action does not appear to have considered these features.

For example, claim 23 recites, *inter alia*, "a first software application on the host machine configured to generate page data having a first bit rate per plane per pixel" and "a second software application on the host machine examining the page data in groups of at least two adjacent pixels." (emphasis added). Further, claim 23 recites, "a first communication device in the host machine configured to transfer the interim data" and "a second communication device in the printing device configure to receive the interim data." (emphasis added).

Chamzas does not describe a host machine and a printing device. The Office Action refers to transmitter 102 as the host machine. *See* Office Action, p. 3. However, based on the interview, the Examiner intended to refer to image source 101. Chamzas states that the image source 101 can be a scanner, such as the scanner in Canon NP-9030, or a data base, such as a magnetic disk. *See* col. 3, line 49. The scanner in a device such as Canon NP-9030 is not a host machine. The Canon NP-9030 is a standalone photocopier. Neither the scanner in a standalone copier nor a magnetic disk or database inside a standalone copier can reasonably be considered a host machine. Therefore, nothing in Chamzas teaches or even suggests a host machine and a printing device.

Because these basic elements missing from the Chamzas reference, the application of the Chamzas to claim 23 fails to meet the claimed features. For example, Chamzas does not teach or suggest "a first software application on the host machine configured to generate page data having a first bit rate per plane per pixel, a second software application on the host machine examining the page data in groups of at least two adjacent pixels" or "a first communication device in the host machine configured to transfer the interim data." Further, Chamzas does not teach or suggest any "software applications" at all. The Office Action seems to have completely disregarded this aspect of the claims.

Claim 23 also recites, "page data having a first bit rate per plane per pixel" and "a print data processor in the host machine configured to render printer ready data based on the examination of the page data and configured to combine the printer ready data with print engine control commands operable to control a print engine to create interim data having a second bit rate per plane per pixel, the second bit rate being lower that the first bit rate."

Chamzas describes the manipulation of image data. However, the discussion in Chamzas is only tangentially related to the type of data claimed. Chamzas states that, "DMUX 111 demultiplexes, in well known fashion, the encoded basic low resolution pixel information, the encoded supplemental information and the encoded classification flags." *See* col. 5, lines 50-55. Subsequently, a decoder "decodes it in known fashion." *See* col. 5, line 55.

The low resolution image, as shown by FIG. 2b, and the high resolution image, as shown by FIG. 2a, are not page data at a first bit rate per plane per pixel and interim data having a second bit rate per plane per pixel. In fact, Chamzas expressly states that the decomposition from high resolution to low resolution changes the number of dots per inch (number of pixels). *See* col. 5, lines 1-8. Therefore, the term resolution, as used by Chamzas, refers to the number of pixels and does not correspond to bit rate per plane per pixel.

When describing the lower resolution described by Chamzas, the Examiner states "the bit rate *could* be slower." *See* Office Action, p. 4 (emphasis added). However, the mere possibility of one of the claimed features is not enough. The M.P.E.P. states, "[t]he mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." *See* M.P.E.P. §2112 (citing *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999)).

Hattori is cited for various aspects of a printing device but not for the host machine. *See* Office Action, p. 4. Hattori does not fill in the gaps left by Chamzas, which are listed above. For example, FIG. 1 illustrates that the processor 300 of Hattori is located in the laser printer 200 and not in the host computer 100.

Roylance describes a resolution enhancement procedure in laser printer. Roylance does not fill in the gaps left by Chamzas because Roylance does not describe any processing in a host machine.

Therefore, none of Chamzas, Hattori, Roylance, and combinations thereof teach or suggest "a first software application on the host machine configured to generate page data having a first bit rate per plane per pixel, a second software application on the host machine examining the page data in groups of at least two adjacent pixels, a first communication device in the host machine configured to transfer the interim data," or "a print data processor in the host machine configured to render printer ready data based on the examination of the page data and configured to combine the printer ready data with print engine control commands operable to control a print engine to create interim data having a second bit rate per plane per pixel, the second bit rate being lower that the first bit rate."

For at least these reasons, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn. Further, the rejections of claims 24-29 should be withdrawn because, at a minimum claims 24-29 depend from claim 23.

Claim 17 includes, generating page data having a first bit rate per plane per pixel from a first application running on a host machine; examining the page data in groups of at least two adjacent pixels by use of a second application running on the host machine; rendering, by the host machine, printer ready data based on the examination of the page data; combining, by the host machine, the printer ready data with print engine control commands operable to control a print engine to create interim data having a second bit rate per plane per pixel, the second bit rate being lower that the first bit rate and transferring the interim data to a printing device.

Chamzas describes a photocopier but does not teach or suggest a host machine and a printing device. Accordingly, Chamzas cannot describe a first application running on a host machine and a second application running on the host machine. Further, Chamzas describes converting from a high resolution to a lower resolution by using fewer pixels, but does not describe page data having a first bit rate per plane per pixel and interim data having a second bit rate per plane per pixel.

Hattori and Roylance do not fill in the gaps left by Chamzas. Further, the Office Action does not rely on Hattori or Roylance for the shortcomings of Chamzas addressed above.

For at least these reasons, Applicants request that the rejections of claim 17 be withdrawn. Further, the rejections of claims 18-20 should be withdrawn because, at a minimum, claims 18-20 depend on claim 17.

Claim 18 recites, "displaying the page data having the first bit rate on a display of the host machine." The Office Action broadly states that the method of claims 17-22 is rendered obvious by the rejection of the system claims. However, the subject of claim 18 is not addressed by the proposed combination of Chamzas, Hattori, and Roylance. For this additional reason, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seek an early allowance thereof. If the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (312) 840-3225.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan Gleitz
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 62,164

BRINKS HOFER
GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: September 23, 2009